

* * *

[ECF Nos. 42, 43]

Next, the Court turns to Norwood's motion corresponding about summons. (ECF No. 42.) In this motion, Norwood states he "was told [he] had a second chance to

1 complete” USM-285¹ forms directing the U.S. Marshal to effectuate service. (*Id.*) Norwood
2 claims he completed service of the summons “using the post office” and completed and
3 mailed the USM-285 forms to the U.S. Marshal’s Service. (*Id.*) In an order filed on January
4 8, 2024, the Court noted that Norwood had not yet properly served Defendants and
5 granted Norwood a 20-day extension of time to complete and return the USM-285 forms,
6 for each defendant, to the U.S. Marshal’s Service. (ECF No. 35 at 2-3.) Therefore,
7 pursuant to the Court’s order, Norwood had until January 29, 2024, to furnish the U.S.
8 Marshal’s Service with the required USM-285 forms. (*Id.* at 4.) The Court also attached
9 the forms for Norwood to fill out and mail to the U.S. Marshal’s Service. (ECF Nos. 35-1,
10 35-2.) Although Norwood attaches documents labeled “proof of service” to his motion,
11 those documents are for the justice court of Reno Township and are not sufficient for the
12 instant suit. (ECF No. 42 at 3-4.) To the extent Norwood intends his motion to show that
13 service has been effectuated, service by mail does not suffice under the Federal or
14 Nevada Rules of Civil Procedure. The U.S. Marshal’s Service has not filed a document
15 showing proof of service or a return of the summons unexecuted and thus the Court
16 cannot determine whether service has been effectuated. Therefore, to the extent
17 Norwood’s motion seeks the Court to certify that he has successfully completed service,
18 the motion is denied.

19 Additionally, Norwood failed to include a memorandum of points and authorities in
20 support of his motion. Pursuant to LR 7-2(d), the failure of a moving party to file points
21 and authorities in support of the motion constitutes consent to the denial of the motion.
22 Therefore, Norwood’s motion corresponding about summons, (ECF No. 42), is also
23 denied pursuant to LR 7-2(d).

24 ///

25 ///

26
27 ¹ Norwood references “the USM-245 form” in his motion, however, the Court
28 construes this as referring to the USM-285 form which is the proper form for requesting
the U.S. Marshals Service effectuate service of process.

1 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Norwood's motion to amend the complaint,
2 (ECF No. 43), is **DENIED**;

3 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Norwood's motion corresponding about
4 summons, (ECF No. 42), is **DENIED**.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 **DATED:** February 20, 2024.

7
8 
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE